



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

TINA DODD,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

CITY OF GREENVILLE *et al.*,  
Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:04-469-HFF-WMC

---

---

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE  
JUDGE AND GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

---

---

This is a case alleging causes of action for gender discrimination under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, violation of Plaintiff's First Amendment rights, outrage, breach of contract, and breach accompanied by fraud. The matter is before the Court for review of the two reports and recommendations (Reports) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting that the Court grant Defendants' motions for summary judgment. The Reports are made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Reports to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Reports on November 14, 2006, and Plaintiff filed objections on December 4, 2006.

In light of the standards set out above, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the record in this case, the Reports and the objections thereto and finds that the Reports are proper.\* Accordingly, the Court overrules Plaintiff's objections, adopts the Reports, incorporates them herein, and **GRANTS** Defendants' motions for summary judgment.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 3rd day of January, 2007, in Spartanburg, South Carolina.

---

s/ Henry F. Floyd  
HENRY F. FLOYD  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

\*Plaintiff's objections are, in fact, a recitation, almost verbatim, of her response to Defendants' motions for summary judgment. In an abundance of caution, however, the Court has considered the submission as true objections and has reviewed the issues raised de novo. Nevertheless, since the Court agrees with the analysis of the Magistrate Judge, the Court will not address each issue a second time.